

REMARKS

In this Response, claims 2-8, 10-17, 35-41 and 43-50 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 3, 7-8, 11, 13-14, 35-37, 39-41 and 43-49 are amended in this paper. Claims 1, 9, 18-34 and 42 have been previously canceled. New claims 51-62 have been added. Thus, claims 2-8, 10-17, 35-41 and 43-62 are presented for examination. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 7, 11, 13, 35-37, 39 and 43-49 have been amended, in part, to correct typographical and grammatical errors. These typographical and grammatical corrections introduce no new matter, nor do they change the scope of the claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In “Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103”, on pages 3-7 of the above-cited Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-8, 10-17, 35-41 and 43-50 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0093694 to Medvinsky et al. (hereinafter “Medvinsky”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,809,144 to Sirbu et al. (hereinafter “Sirbu”) under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,093,020 to McCarty et al. (hereinafter “McCarty”).

Notwithstanding that Applicants respectfully disagree with the above reading by the Examiner, in order to obtain early allowance of claims 2-8, 10-17, 35-41 and 43-50, and to further clarify the claimed subject matter, independent claims 7, 13, 40 and 46 have been amended, dependent claims 3, 8, 11, 14, 36, 41 and 47 have been amended and new claims 51-62 have been added as discussed below.

The Examiner has remarked, on page 2 and again on page 7 of the above-cited Office Action, that optional language, such as “if so” clauses, do not limit the claim in the case where the “if” fails to be true. Applicants agree with the Examiner in as much that, in a case where one of two options must be true, a reference must be cited against at least one of the options. Applicants respectfully submit that, in the extant application,

none of the references can be read against “determining if the requested service is provided by a plurality of servers”, which is outside the influence of the “if so” and “if not” clauses of previously presented claim 7, and therefore, either case distinguishes over the cited art. Notwithstanding that Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner in his non-formal objection to the optional language, to forward prosecution of the extant application, claim 7 has been amended to eliminate the optional language.

Amended claim 7 reads: “determining, by the granting service, that the requested service is provided by a plurality of servers,” and claim 8 has been converted to an independent claim which recites the alternative: “determining, by the granting service, that the requested service is not provided by a plurality of servers.” Independent claims 13, 40 and 46 and dependent claim 41 have been amended similarly. New claims 52 and 58 have been added to provide the alternate case where it was eliminated from previously presented claims 13 and 46. New claims 51, 53-57 and 59-62 have been added in order to provide dependent claims for the alternative cases that are now in separate independent claims 8, 41, 52 and 58. New claims 51-62 add no new matter, merely separate the two options, the “if so” and “if not” cases, previously presented.

The Examiner stated that Medvinsky does not disclose “the granting service determining if the requested service is provided by a plurality of servers: if not, the granting service generating the Service Ticket utilizing a single server mode; and if so, the granting service: generating a session key; for each providing server, encrypting the session key with a secret key associated with each respective server” (Applicants’ previously presented claim 7) and cited McCarty to read on these features.

Claim 7 has been amended to read:

“upon determining that the requested service is provided by a plurality of servers, the granting service:

generating a session key;

for each providing server, encrypting the session key with a secret key associated with each respective server.”

Applicants respectfully submit that McCarty fails to teach or suggest the following features in amended claim 7: “determining that the requested service is provided by a plurality of servers”, “generating a session key” and “for each providing server, encrypting the session key with a secret key associated with each respective server”.

McCarty describes an “integration module” acting as an interface between users and external systems. McCarty teaches that a user logs in and is displayed a user interface that displays the multiple services that are available through multiple external systems online in a large institution such as a university. (McCarty, Figure 4) There is no teaching or suggestion in McCarty of a determining whether “the requested service is provided by a plurality of servers” as recited in amended claim 7. In the teachings of McCarty, there is no service particularly requested upon logging in to the “integration module”. Nor is there a teaching of determining whether “the requested service is not provided by a plurality of servers” as recited in amended claim 8. In amended claim 7, this recitation cannot be ignored, since you cannot generate secret keys and so forth for “each providing server” unless you can determine which of a plurality of servers provides “the requested service”.

The Examiner has cited McCarty to read on at least two elements of encryption: “generating a session key” and “encrypting the session key with a secret key associated with each respective server for each providing server”, both performed by a granting service in amended claim 7. In McCarty, each external system sends the integration module a session identifier (McCarty, claim 10 and Column 16, Lines 38-41). Assuming that the Examiner is reading the “external systems” on applicants plurality of “servers”, and assuming *arguendo* that a “session identifier” can be read on a “session key”, McCarty teaches a process reverse of that claimed in amended claim 7. Each of McCarty’s external systems provide a session identifier; not, as in claim 7, a session key which is generated by the granting service, and which can then be encrypted yet further by providing a secret key “for each providing server”.

Even if assumed *arguendo*, that the “session identifiers” in McCarty may read on the “session key” of claim 7, Applicants submit that nothing in McCarty teaches or

suggests that either the integration module or the “external systems” or any other mechanism in McCarty encrypts “the session key with a secret key associated with each respective server for each providing server”. This recitation is not found in McCarty, nor any of the other cited references. (Likewise, amended claim 8 recites, “encrypting the cipher text with a secret key associated with the providing server”, and, therefore, claim 8 also distinguishes over McCarty.)

Medvinsky and Sirbu fail to cure the above deficiency of McCarty. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the combination of Medvinsky, Sirbu and McCarty fails to teach or suggest each and every element of amended claim 7 and amended claim 8.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the combination of Medvinsky, Sirbu and McCarty fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for amended claims 7 and 8, and amended claims 7 and 8 are therefore patentable over Medvinsky in view of Sirbu and further in view of McCarty under 35 USC §103(a). Reconsideration in the light of amendments is respectfully requested.

Amended independent claim pairs 40 and 41, 13 and 52, 46 and 58 contain generally similar recitations as claims 7 and 8. Therefore, for at least similar reasons set forth for claims 7 and 8, Applicants submit claims 40 and 41, 13 and 52, 46 and 58 are also patentable over Medvinsky in view of Sirbu and further in view of McCarty under 35 USC §103 (a). Reconsideration of previously presented claims in the light of amendments, and consideration of new claims, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 10-12, 14-17, 35-39, 43-45, 47-50 and new claims 51, 53-57, 59-62 depend from amended claims 7, 8, 13, 40 and 41 or new claims 52 and 58, respectively, incorporating their recitations. Therefore, for at least similar reasons set forth for the corresponding independent claims, Applicants submit that claims 2-6, 10-12, 14-17, 35-39, 43-45, 47-50 and new claims 51, 53-57, 59-62 are also patentable over Medvinsky in view of Sirbu and further in view of McCarty under 35 USC §103 (a). Reconsideration of previously presented claims in the light of amendments, and consideration of new claims, is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of pending claims are solicited. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 381-8819. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: 07/07/2009

by: /Al AuYeung/
Al AuYeung
Reg. No.: 35,432

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-2000
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981